

# Mobility Committee Meeting Transcript – 4/17/2018

Title: ATXN 24/7 Recording

Channel: 6 - ATXN

Recorded On: 4/17/2018 6:00:00 AM

Original Air Date: 4/17/2018

Transcript Generated by SnapStream

=====

[3:03:41 PM]

>> Good afternoon, everyone. I'm going to call to order the meeting of the mobility committee. And first item of business is approval of the minutes. So do I have a motion, motion from councilmember Flanagan? Second from councilmember Garza. All in favor? The minutes pass. Next we'll do citizen communication. We have three people for citizen communication. We'll start with -- in three minutesish for citizen communication. Again, citizen communication is for any comments people want to make on the items that are not on the agenda. So we're ear starting with Gus Pena, David king, after Gus and then John leycok last. >> Good afternoon. Good afternoon. This is Gus Pena. I'm co-founder of veterans for progress. First of all, I deviate a little bit and thank you councilmember alter for running a darn good council meeting last time. I mean, my wife was impressed. Anyway, thank you for your professionalism. Veterans for progress was born because of the atrocities to us veterans at the clinics and the hospitals but I am co-founder and president of veterans for progress. And one of the things -- a lot of the things I was asked to address over here and I'll -- personally is that we talk about affordability for this mobility issue. But what we find out is new one to go into effect by June by capital metro. Negative the effect -- the impact of the people. A lot of people left without transportation because of the new routes and this has nothing do with the agenda. But it hurts the most vulnerable and socioeconomic status people.

[3:05:42 PM]

How will this bond issue request rather improve affordability. That's the question I was asked to bring to over here. I don't need any answer right now. People on fixed incomes will be negatively impacted by cuts in bus routes and these other -- other options that y'all have. I'm going to leave it at that. Because I feel redundant at its worse is not good. But please do something positive. I'm not saying you haven't done something positive before. You have. But do positive to not negatively impact the community and make it more poor because of the funding that will need to be utilized and spent on these issues. Anyway, I'm all for improving mobility. But let's get it best done the best way in and for the people that

are more vulnerable and won't be negatively impacted by any choice you make. Have a good afternoon.

>> Thank you, chair, vice chair, committee members. I appreciate your service to the community. I know you have challenging jobs. A lot of people have great expectations of you. I'll try to be reasonable. And I want to thank you for your work. I know you all care about our city and you're doing everything you can to help everyone who lives here and the folks who want to move here as well. So thank you. I'm just here today to really follow up with what Mr. Pena said looking at the decisions we made with transit and making sure we have the data to we need to ensure that our decisions are helping people who are struggling and who need help, trois need our help. As Ryan Robinson said about every five to six years roughly 50,000 high income people move to central Austin and many want to live here in the urban core.

[3:07:45 PM]

So our dynamically our city is changing. Where we see wealthier people hiring and middle and lower income families moving outside of the you are bop core. Code next is going to facilitate the production of high income housing for high income families. That's one of the key things it's going to do. Middle income families are going to be serviced by the housing as it ages over time, 10, 20 years down the road. It will trickle down to middle income families. The high income housing that's built in the urban core. Looking down the road 10 to 20 years, I don't see that we're going to fundamentally change that dynamic where wealthy or high income people are moving to the urban areas where we're investing in transit. We're investing big dollars in transit. Who is that going to benefit? Is it going to benefit the low and middle income families that are living on the outside of the urban core? Those being displaced? I think we need data so we can help you. We need data on transit dependent riders and choice riders, the data that shows the routes to and from bus stops those groups have to use to get to and from their bus stops. In other words, does a transit dependent rider have to walk further than a choice rider? That's code word for I don't have have to ride the bus. I have plenty of other alternatives. And we need data about the number of transfers the groups have to take to get to and from work. Does the rider have to spend two or three hours a day in transit just to get back and forth? Is that equitable and fair? What about the length of time it takes to get to services like doctors and grocery stores?

[3:09:48 PM]

We need data. We can produce that data. You can look at the data and make decisions that will help us address the inequity we have in our transit systems and in our transit policies. Thank you very much. >> Thank you. >> John leycock. >> I'm John leycock. I'm representing aura. I want to talk about the transit authority in Guadalupe. Brief response to the two previous comments. We have some data that aura and farm city is also representing here show that the cap metro remap will provide 75% low income house holds with frequent transit within a quarter mile of their house. So it is a step that's going to improve access for everyone across the spectrum briefly. Back to the Guadalupe. This is the transit corridor for cap metro. One that will be seven riders and all of the main routes, the one that we -- the

one to -- [indiscernible] Huge corridor but also congested. We have the opportunity to improve the reliability of the system and putting transit authority on Guadalupe. It's great for buses. It doesn't hurt cars a lot. And it's something that will make the whole system better. So a district 9 project, but you have a bus like the three. Down the mark by district 5. South park meadow and hit district 8 and district two. It's stuck in the traffic, it's bad for all of it. It goes north and gets to go

[3:11:49 PM]

through the own lane through those like the 3 or the 19 can hit district 7 and 10 and 4. So this is something that will benefit the entire city. And I think it is something we need to make the strong commitment to if Austin is going to have a functioning, working bus system. Thank you. >> Thank you. Colleagues, we're going to turn to -- that was citizen communication. We're going to turn to item number three, which is approval of the community meeting schedule. So -- >> We had another one sign up for assistant communications, Scott Johnson. >> Okay, Scott? >> Good afternoon councilmembers. Here to talk about distracted driving. This is national distracted driving month this month. It's not on the pvshgs io but I hope lit be soon to support that safety matter. Back in 2014, the prior council approved a hands free ordinance that's still in effect. But they exempted a part of the ordinance that the other approximately 44 cities within Texas are able to use for enforcement purposes. And that is letter a out there which means that when you're stopped in a travel lane, that law enforcement can enforce the ordinance. I spoke with San Antonio police department recently and anecdotally, they are using that capability to enforce their ordinance. And what that can allow for is when someone is stopped at a traffic light or in traffic now, they can roll into the crosswalk which happens even if they don't have a mobile communication device. However, if the enforcement can be there, and the awareness can be grown, then that issue, which is a very much a hazard to people who are elderly, people rolling baby carts, people

[3:13:51 PM]

walking, distracted or not, that can help their safety. This is something when I brought it to the safety commission, this is one commissioner who liked it the way it currently is and I did not have all of the data by the fillings study by the triple a foundation. I do have the data and it can be a distraction after someone looks at their phone, texts, Facebooks, puts it down. Continues forward and continues on one of the highways. In that information, a peer-reviewed study, it's important for city councilmembers to consider knowing more about this and consider supporting it to close what I consider to be a loophole the thought was for the prior council and with tacit support from the police department that a person can check their messages while they're stopped. Yes, but they can also plan their trip differently and they could also be more aware and mindful of people walking, biking, and in other forms of transportation. So another issue that I wanted to mention is something that just came into prominence with the 60-minute story. You're dealing with transportation from a vehicular standpoint. But I would encourage the council and aviation department to do what they can do to make passengers aware of

the safety records of airlines that fly from via. Talking about a region in particular that has had significant problems. I've never flown on them. But that's something this council should keep in mind and encourage the aviation department to consider. Another matter I brought to your attention to last year that there's progress on is there's an opportunity to combine the air quality program and the transportation project with the sustainability -- find the

[3:15:52 PM]

protection program and they are in discussions from what I understand. I hope that's successful. Thank you very much. >> Thank you, Mr. Johnson. Item three, the approval of the meeting schedule for the remainder of the year. So any comments? Tore do I have a comment to improve the schedule? So move by councilmember Flanagan. Passing the meeting schedule which means the next meeting will be June 21. Now take up item number 4. Project connect. This is an update for us on project connect. >> Afternoon, councilmember kitchen, members of the committee. Vice president at capital metro. Thank you for letting us be here to present an update on project connect. I know you have a busy agenda. I'm going to move quickly through our slide deck. But I want to update you all and be glad to answer any questions either as we go through or at the end. So, most of you, I'm sure I think all of you have heard of project connect and you've heard me give this presentation. I apologize for that. We are talking about a regional transit vision. It's not just about moving people. We're putting a major emphasis on outcomes. That's beyond moving people. That's all of the other benefits and needs this community have in terms of providing mobility to accomplish all the other things people do in their daily lives. Some of the key ones, affordability. I heard a comment on that. Transit and auto dependent

[3:17:52 PM]

community house holds are spending 30% of their income on transportation whereas those who live in transit support of areas that can walk, bike, and take transit, they can spend less than 10% of their house hold income on transportation. So that's a huge component of the affordability equation. Similar stories can be told about health, walking, and using transit or positively correlated with better health. Highly functioning neighborhoods, economic development, many of our competing cities that we're working or competing against for economic development opportunities or investing substantially in public transportation. Transit is one of the safest modes of travel. And one of the greenest modes of travel in terms of the environment. So again it is a regional mobility vision. We're focused on a multi-generational investment. The point being this is not something to accomplish in one single effort. We're likely looking at a series of different investments over time to build out a system. We are behind. Looking at the peers, we need to catch up, make investments, copt B to grow, make economic success, equity and affordability and other things this city cares so much about. Looking at improving existing services and adding new services, which I'll talk about more in just a moment. And the overarching theme, given the name of the project of project connect is really about connecting people, places, and

other things that they need to do on their daily lives. Why public education is so critical, especially as we grow from the current population to more than doubling by 2040. Just doing the way we've been

[3:19:53 PM]

doing business in terms of handling mobility is not going to keep working as we grow to a major metropolitan area than even bigger than we already are today. This little graphic kind of explains why. If you look at the two intersection examples. On one side, you see a typical intersection and how many people can move through there for each traffic signal when they have a green time and they contrast it with the one on the other side. You take the same footprint, the same right of way and you use it more efficiently by focusing on moving people and not simply automobiles, you'd get much smaller person throughput. This is one microexample, if you compound this against all of the other corridors in the region as we have on our map there, it makes a huge difference in terms of helping people get to where they need to go and improving mobility. So in terms of the studies, short term investments married with long-term investments, higher capital investments to really comprehensively come together to create a transit network on a regional scale. So we'll talk and probably focus on the 11 major high capacity corridors, but it's important to note that this plan also includes a number of other components, including express services, with new park and rides, so folks that live in areas that may not be suitable for traditional transit still are able to access transit to get in and out of the center of the city. Mobility hubs, those are places where we envisioned sort of like our transit centers or park and rides today but with a whole range of mobility options they'll be able to do -- be cycled there, take a car to go, tnc, take public transit, a van

[3:21:55 PM]

pool. All of those are work together to give a comprehensive approach to giving the community options other than driving alone. We've gone through a three-phase process. The details on how we phase this plan. The big picture now. Public review and comment on that including today's meeting. The next step will be how do we phase it? What is the -- what's the community's priorities. What are the ones that makes the most sense to go first, second, and third and so on. Also funding. Obviously a huge picture in this equation. How are we going to pay for this? So we're looking at the entire range of funding alternatives. Then we'll narrow down in the coming months the programs and recommendations we'll take to the board of directors and ultimately seek public support for. And a look at the system map and a couple of levels, we have the regional perspective. You can see the plan reaches well beyond the capital metro service area. We have commuter routes for example for example beyond that. Outlying communities are growing fast and their mobility needs are changing. They're quickly realizing they need more options than just automobiles to get to and from places. Then we have what we call the urban perspective. It's the heart of the city if you will. We have other solutions, mobility solutions that will work in concert with the major corridors that we're proposing to develop that could include things like

mobility in Zones where we have different ways of getting people around. It could be microtransit. Some of you have seen chariots

[3:23:55 PM]

operating in Austin. Other private providers we might partner with to feed into the high capacity corridors. Then the downtown. Really continuing to be the economic and civic heart of our entire region. And we've come up with different ideas that can help dramatically improve the functionality and utility within the urban core. So that's a big part of our plan. One highlight, actually two real quick on the east side of downtown, we're looking at a north-south spine that would complement the one we already have on Guadalupe and Lavaca to the west of the capital and to the west of Congress. So you start to get two major south corridors. We also have a new east-west corridor that would really come right across the center of the city on 7th and 5th and 6th on the west side to create a connection from west-to-east. That's one of the things we heard consistently through the process is better east-west connections. So overall, this is the system deck. The graph is hard to see on the smaller scale. So a couple of highlights. There's 11 high capacity transit corridors identified. Most of these are on places that you would expect. It's the major corridors in our city and in our region. The Burnett roads, MLK, Manor, South Lamar, South Congress, so on. These are some of the major corridors, these are some of the places where the demand, the land use, all of the other factors that go into assessing where would high capacity transit make the most sense? We've evaluated as well as substantial public input to put this map together. And we've also given them a preliminary ranking in terms of priority. So we put three of them at the top of the list in terms of the highest ridership potential.

[3:25:57 PM]

That would be North Lamar, South Congress, and Riverside. Just on river side alone, this is happening is incredible and really speaks to the potential for strong ridership. Also the need -- one development alone that's proposing 70,000 new trips in that corridor that cannot be handled with single occupancy vehicles. We know that. Got to have a more robust transit network to manage that incredible growth we're seeing. The second tier we labeled high ridership corridors and we had medium and then we had the developing corridors. Those are ones that we think have great potential but there are some, either a development, infrastructure, or other improvement that needs to happen before they're really ripe for high capacity transit. So in terms of the multi-generational plan, those are the ones that would probably happen in the outer years of our picture. But as communities and developments occur, we may see over time they shift. Some lower ranked, for example, now. They may move up in the rankings as development happens, other things happen that make them more viable. So in a nutshell, I think that's kind of the heart of it. We'll do some public involvement that I'll speak to in a moment and we do want your feedback and the public's feedback on our vision map. In terms of the outreach, the community involvement events, the traffic jam with the great new central library back in the end of March. Now we're just beginning tomorrow night in Colony Park. Kick off six what we're calling mini traffic jams held

in conjunction with the city of Austin. And the Austin strategic mobility plan. Again, the first one is tomorrow night, 6:30 to 8:00 P.M. At the

[3:27:59 PM]

turner Roberts rec center and then five more after that over the coming month or six weeks to gather public input. Another piece we're doing kind of a cool thing is we actually knowing the people can't always come to our meetings, we're going to where they are. We retrofitted two of our buses. We'll take it out to grocery stores, civic centers, senior centers, so on. So people can give their input, learn about project connect, right there where they are rather than asking them to come to one of our public meetings. We are coordinating extensively throughout this effort. Javier and his team have done a great job partnering with Mike tremble and the bond projects with the strategic mobility plan and with a number of other things going on in our region in terms of trying to make sure to the degree we can that all of the pieces are fitting together and complementing and not working at cross pumps. And just in terms of our time line, some of the next key step S. And just in terms of our time line, some of the next key step Su. And just in terms of our time line, some of the next key step R. And just in terms of our time line, some of the next key step P. And just in terms of our time line, some of the next key step O. And just in terms of our time line, some of the next key step S. And just in terms of our time line, some of the next key step E. And just in terms of our time line, some of the next key step ss. And just in terms of our time line, some of the next key step S, we're developing the output now and early this summer. We hope to get back to the board of directors with the priority -- after we heard all of the public input, we'll be consolidating that, continuing our technical analysis and returning with the recommendation. We have the draft plan, we want to bring a final plan back. And then also in the later this year, ask our partner industries, city of Austin, Travis county, and others to also endorse that plan. Because that's really a key framework for this overall effort. If we look at cities that have done this successfully, one of the things they've done is get that buy-in on that vision

[3:30:00 PM]

early. And to the degree you can, understand that some things are going to change. But stick to that as your guiding light so to speak as you move forward. >> One key component we want to enter as soon as we can. Preliminary ranking work. That's the critical piece to keep the momentum going but also to drill down. We've done a lot of technical work to date. If we need more, we're going to ask the public to support this, we'll have a lot of detailed questions. That engineering work is how we get answers to a lot of the detailed questions on the specifics of each of the different corridors we'll be looking at. So we want to kick that off in early 2019, that will move forward from there. Continue to work on the funding plan. And then potentially have the funding referendum in November of 2020. So that will be an on going process as we move into phase 3 of the plan. So in a quick nutshell, that kind of sums up where we're at and we'll be glad to answer any questions you might have. >> Thank you, thank you Mr. Hemmington. Do we have questions from councilmember Garza? >> Tom, last week at a work session,

councilmember Houston brought up the green line. It was an issue that we hasn't heard about, the green line. There's state legislation that prevents us from using it. I wasn't -- are you aware of -- >> Eric Bustos can correct me if I'm wrong. My understanding is the state legislation is not that we can't use it, we can. We must have voter approval to add passenger rail to any new corridor in the region. >> Okay. >> So regardless of even for

[3:32:00 PM]

example when we need to ask for additional funding, even if we had the funding secured, we still have to have a separate action by the voters to authorize us to use any corridor for new passenger rail services. >> I appreciate the conversation around equity for east Austin and pleasant valley is considered also one of those, that that would -- that's a corridor that isn't finished out. And so that would -- what would be the timeline on trying to find funding for that corridor? To be considered -- >> Sure. Really the key piece there. Early on, I think the team identified that we have south congress headed to the south and we didn't have much in terms of high capacity transit on the corridor on the river side. So we identified one of the key reasons that makes sense because as you know, there's only a few places where you can cross the river. Pleasant valley being one of them. That corridor began to make a lot of sense. We looked at it. As you know, south of Riverside, the corridor is continuous. So our understanding is that the city is understanding it now in terms of bridging that proverbial gap, getting that segment completed, ideally constructed in such a way as to be able to support high capacity transit in the future as a key initial step. And then beyond that, that will be part of the thinking as we get to the phasing and funding component. >> Okay, thanks. >> Other questions? >> I have questions but they relate to the potential bond actions. I don't know if this is the right time or not.

[3:34:02 PM]

>> Which bond do you mean? >> Proposal for the connect funding. Not sure -- >> We could deal with that. We have something related to that. If we could deal with that, could you stick around. The and the next couple of items are related. So if you don't mind holding until we get to that. I have questions for you on the green line. So I assume that would it be correct to assume that the legislative authority to use that line could be requested at the same time we ask for funding? >> Yes, ma'am. >> Okay. So we wouldn't have to have two separate votes to do that. So we could move forward with green line authorization on the 2020 at the same time we're looking for funding or we could do it before then I suppose. >> Yes. That is correct. You could include it in whatever 2020 ends up being that could be one piece of it for sure. >> Okay. >> All right. >> I was following the last session. Senator Watson was -- couldn't get past the -- the -- it got killed before it even got to a vote because they were just such negative opinion of Austin at that time. That they didn't want to give us anything. That's basically -- I'm very disappointed for me because it wouldn't cost the state anything. But just insisted that we would have it to the voters. Are we going to have -- all of the voters at manor and all that in order to invest money into that green line?



[3:36:03 PM]

>> Yeah, for the green line, a vote of the capital metro service area. And just to clear up a little bit, what we had in the last session was a bill asking to remove that session requirement for us that we would have to go seek voter approval to not necessarily start the green line, but even pay as you go improvements to the line to get it ready for a one-day future investment. Right now, we're prohibited doing anything, what we're currently doing is brake service on that line without voter approval. I sent out a sheet to all of your offices detailing that history. So happy to -- >> Have any feelings about since we're not asking the voters to -- to invest anything. Any money in it yet. It's just the approval to do improvements to it. Do you have any feelings that you can ask the voters for a feeling. >> What the statute requires, 12 miles or longer, we would have to have a referendum in an even number year during the November election cycle. If it's 12 miles or less, we could call up the election on any normal election cycle. The next municipal election. So that is really what we would have to make, that's what project connect is doing, having the discussions on -- we'll get there about sequencing and what's happened. That's the restriction on the green line right now is that we're not able to do really much with it without voter approval. >> Okay. The next two tie items are related. Stick around, we might have questions for cap metro. Before -- we do have people

[3:38:03 PM]

signed up for this item. We have two people. I'm going to go ahead and call them. And this is specific to project connect. So if you have comments specific to project connect and the two folks are Tristan -- Tristan? Tristan, I'm not sure how to pronounce your last name. I apologize. >> Tristan, I'm here -- I want to thank y'all for your time, councilmembers. I wanted to request that while you're considering moving this program forward that the funding for the environmental aspect and engineering aspect is expedited as quickly as possible, attaching that to a bond just seems a little unnecessary given the magnitude of money there, \$50 million is the money you come up with all the time in your budgeting sessions, especially when you don't have a public safety contract and all of that, there's a little more -- seems like a little more leeway on y'all's end of things. This is kind of a once in a lifetime opportunity. Go big. It's necessary. Thank you. >> You signed up for this too. You spoke in citizen communication. Do you have anything that's here? I don't see him. He may have left. We're going to move on to item 5. This is the corridor construction program, specifically as it relates to public transportation, public transit and project connect. >> Mike tremble, part of the program office. We did brief council and following up on some of the questions. I didn't have my slides. I'll just quickly go to the section that talks about coordination with project connect. That's some of the key questions asked so --

[3:40:05 PM]

>> We have the presentation. We don't have it? So I'll just wing it. So, yeah, you have -- you may have the slides in the back. It's just for referencing the briefing you had in the last week. We've been doing a lot of coordination with capital metro as we've been developing the construction program and we are going to continue that as we look to implementation. What we talked to council in work session is where we go after council action on the 26th. And so what we move into is our preliminary engineering phase and design phase. We estimated coming out of the plans that we had 3% to 5% of actual design work done, so we still have a lot of runway left to work as far as engineering and full design. And so we're anticipating getting through preliminary engineering by the beginning of calendar year 2019. So the types of things we would do in that phase is we would be doing survey work, geotechnical work. We're going to do some of the environmental work, looking at drainage issues, updating our cost-risk assessment. Updating our cost estimate as well. And so we'll get a lot of the basic data collection that we would need. Tonya mentioned that with some things they'll be looking at with the preliminary engineering. We look at the similar types of data and we hope to share that information with capital metro as we're gathering that where we can be efficient and sharing and using some of the data that we're collecting. So we're going to be working with them all along the way as we are moving to the preliminary phase. Talking about what we're learning. Following up with the community as well, doing additional public

[3:42:07 PM]

engagement to talk more about what is in the investment packages and what we're learning in the preliminary phase as well. We'd love to brief council on what we learned in the preliminary phase and any updates to the plans we have, cost information, other information we received and at that point, council will give us additional direction as we're looking to move to full design. Again, we're anticipating getting to that point by early calendar year 2019. So with that, that's the gist of what our discussion was on the project connect. Be happy to answer any questions. >> Why don't you give us a -- I know you sent us information and appreciate that. I share it with my colleagues. That gave us an idea of the -- of the current plan as we understand it today before the -- before the additional study that you all do. In terms of what kind of improvements will benefit transit. Can you speak in general to those. >> Sure. >> Maybe give an example for? >> Sure. So, yeah. I think we sent council a copy of the memorandum that we had done in 2016 as we were developing the bond package for 2016. And it talked -- talked about looking at the improved connectivity to the transit stop. Prioritization of transit along the corridors. Talked about the jumps and the bus pullouts and those types of improvements. Those are exactly the types of improvements we have lined up for full design and construction. We're looking at finishing out and improving the connectivity for bike and ped to several of the transit stops. Coordinating on the transit stops and looking at enhancing

[3:44:07 PM]

service as far as the connections and remap far of their services. And also the signalization. We're looking at several improvements along the corridors. A lot of what was mentioned in the memorandum from capital metro, we tried to go off and check it out, are we doing something? Yeah. We feel like we're addressing the bulk of those types of improvements including looking at improved connections where we can to transit centers also, for example, several transit pullouts on south Lamar associated with that. Those are the examples of the types of improvements we're doing to support that as well. So, again, we're going to continue to coordinate with capital metro and make sure we're staying on the best page, how best to support their transit operations and any adjustments to that that may happen making sure we're coordinating. That will happen in the design phase. Cap metro will be there with us. We wouldn't put in an improvement that they wouldn't want. It will have to impact in a positive way. The preliminary data is after February and January. That's when we sit down with cap metro and design the transit improvements along the corridor. The next full design phase is when that happens. >> If I'm understanding correctly, that time frame dovetails with the dugsal level of analysis that kept -- that cap metro will need to do about project connect. So my understanding is that that's the time you can come back to us, you and cap metro and have a more definitive idea of what specific act -- what specific improvements might need to happen on a particular corridor. You have a lot of ideas now with what you've given us. But questions like whether there

[3:46:09 PM]

can be a dedicated lane or things like that, may require some additional analysis of right of way and those kinds of things before you'll be able to make that determination. Is that the right kind of thinking about it? >> We'll have a much better idea, for example, like you mentioned, the right of way, those types of needs. We'll have a better idea when we get the survey back. Soil conditions from geotechnical analysis. Those are the things that will further inform what we might deal with. And capital metro saying we were all talking about supporting and making better connectivity. This is what it's looking like now. And checking with them. Is this making sense? We'll update the schematics with the information, the role plots that you've seen about the corridors and where some of the improvements might go. We'll update it with real information saying does this make sense? This is where they're looking at transit stops. Having the good connectivity. They're great. Get that back. Update council. And, yes, it looks like something to make sense to move forward with in operations. >> One of the biggest things that's going to mesh is cap metro has to do the prioritization. We will know out of that map what you all recommend, cap metro, recommends to come first. And that will have our time in this corridor program. And that's why if we come back, we will come back January and February, you'll know that. And then you can decide, we can decide what should go together, what should wait, depending on the prioritization and project connect. That's how we think it plays in in that January, February, March thing. >> I have a motion. I'm going to wait before I bring that forward to see if my colleagues have any questions? Go ahead. >> Thank you. I want to follow up on the chairs, questions regarding the cap metro 2016 recommendations. So I appreciate that sort of high level of how you're implementing it.

[3:48:12 PM]

It would be helpful to have a crosswalk. They were specific in the kinds of things that you want it. You have the corridor that seems that are reasonable similar level of detail. Might be helpful to have that. At the very least to know what you're doing that they wanted to do and why. Is that something that you can provide us? >> You can provide a little more information, organize it a little different, for example, the connectivity of transit stops. We can organize it around that category. And the prioritization we ask for, we can organize that too. >> With that being said, we have to go through the designs. Some of the ideas in cap metro and both of us thinking conceptually, we go through design, something might fall out, something might come in. So you need to understand, the level we're at now, we don't know for sure what's going to be in place. >> And it's fine to have that caveat. We got what when he want. It's part of what we're doing. Part of what we're trying to understand is are we setting up a process that's going to allow us to meet the transit needs and are we going to be doing things that we're going to have to repay again five years later because you have to think through the process. I know you guys are doing that. But in our role, that's one of the things that we've been asked as councilmembers to be looking into. And so to the extent to provide some clarity, this will be determined at the design phase, that's fine. But you can have it in there, you have it in your chart. We know that you know this is one of the things to look at in your design phase and you have more confidence to be able to xhub Kate to voters that we have paid attention to that. Also, very specifically, what you're not doing that they want -- that would be helpful. I had requested the rankings without the length with the normalization factor the other day. And I know I just asked you

[3:50:13 PM]

yesterday tore day before so you may not have it, I'm still very much interested in trying to understand. The process that happened at the end. You combine the mobility and the community factors and they normalized it by the length, if that had major effects on the rankings. I've gone through the formula. I think there are questions on that for me. One way I can help myself understand that better would be to have that comparison of what would it -- what would the ranking look like where the costs right next to it so I can do my own analysis of if I'm getting the bang for the buck would be helpful. So I could see if it gives us different things or if it's all the same or one or two projects, we request focus in on the projects to understand the things that we're weighing. >> Okay. >> Thank you. >> Other comments? Okay. I'm going to read the motion so that people are aware of it and then we have three speakers. See if we have anything to add before we -- before we vote. Does that make sense. This is a motion that I have with city staff. This comes back to us with cap metro and taking a -- a look at how things are lining up to do the preliminary engineering. So there are two be it resolved. These are recommendations to the city council and then bring it forward at city council also. That the committee recommends the city manager be directed by city council to return to council at the completion of the preliminary engineering phase of the construction program for approval to proceed with further

[3:52:14 PM]

design and implementation of the ccp -- the corridor construction program. And you know of course that you all are doing that, and the Austin strategic mobility plan to advance projects and programs to improve transit performance and availability through transit priority treatments ensuring that the ccp planning does not preclude options for further transit investments along the corridors. And that the ccp preliminary engineering phase includes transit supportive improvements recommended by cap metro in a memo dated June 13, 2016 titled assessment of city assessment of improval proposals. Last part of councilmember alter just mentioned is basically what this does is memorialize what we just said in terms of bringing information back to the council at the end of that preliminary engineering process. But also just provides our direction in which I know is something that you said you'd be engaged in that during that phase you -- you look at the recommendations that cap metro looked forward in this memo and you include that information that comes back to us about whether you continue to make sense, whether we're going forward with them or not. And in the meantime, understanding that you don't have all of the information. But in the meantime, you can give us in response to councilmember alter's request what you do know at this point about how the particular items in this memo relate -- understanding that you still have work to do. So go ahead. >> May I just add a few. We don't have the last three. >> There we go.

[3:54:16 PM]

>> So I move that -- I'm going to go ahead and move that motion. We'll set it on the table while the speaker speaks. I make a motion. Do I have a second? The second from councilmember Garza. We have a few speakers and then we'll make a vote. Jay Crossley and he's got donated time, it's five minutes. Josiah, I hope I'm saying that right, Stevenson. >> And I have a handout. Jay, is the person who's donating to you here. Okay. >> Hello? Thank you, councilmembers for your service to all of the people in Austin and for the opportunity to speak. My name is Crossley and I live in the traditional 650 square foot duplex in district up with my wife, 4-year-old son in one car. Got a ride and then walked and rode in an el electric scooter. It seemed important to note. As I assume you all are aware, back in I believe December of last year, Nick Mo raised concerns with the prioritization matrix. Explaining what we believe are logical errors in the matrix. This was brought to corridor staff attention as a member of the stake holder committee. Or group. But he never received a reply at that time. This is difficult weird stuff and concerns were raised and we didn't quite understand it. Once the staff recommendations were presented, we started diving in. And raising alarms. At first, this was difficult to do, because the data and matrix

[3:56:17 PM]

were not public. Even, I believe, at the late moment that council could have voted on this, this allocation of half a billion dollars, the data and matrix were not public. So I hope you all are aware of the concern

we've been trying to send this to all of staff and councilmember offices that there's two normalizations by length in this thing that renders the public results in somewhat -- not the best. Essential lil, we believe the matrix, the results are which are the longest projects in a way. In the primary determinant of whether a project was suggested for funding was the length of the project. On few skating the mobility benefits. We read the memo in response to the concerns and we don't believe it answers the concerns. While it makes sense, so there's a common sense concept if you're looking at two projects you arrived at length to be able to compare them. But that doesn't make sense. If you have two projects, one is a mile long, one is ten miles long, each one had the community members equally benefitting, that means 100 people benefit equally either way you go. And dividing by length messes up your understanding of the community benefits. And then sort of dividing by length twice is what made the matrix essentially just give you a report on the length of the projects. Oh following public information and requests, we hand typed the data, scrubbed the PDF. Coming from what it's looking for. I have my lap top up here. We're able to confirm our suspicions and we were able to remove both the first and second

[3:58:18 PM]

normalizations to see what would happen. And to use all of the good work that the office has done to understand the mobility Ben if I wants. And I've given you -- this is a different list, the results of this process if you remove the normalizations. It's a different set of projects, adding up the raw mobility and community scores of this set of projects and the recommended set of projects, this set of projects produces twice as much benefit. According to this method, 15 high-scoring projects that would add up to \$410 million. So we're considering these projects and the rest of the spending. The caveats about the rest of the projects, once the length bias is removed, no project of slaughter scores well. So an argument to include some funds for slaughter anyway. To get the geographic spread. Next the -- the original plan to improve the drag was done in 2003. And as many people have noted, it's high time to modernize one of our most important corridors. So some investment there makes sense. And then the next project cut off was airport from manor to 183. It would make sense to put some money there. But that project was too big to get the use the rest of the money. So we suggest you consider these things. I'm aware I'm delivering a quite difficult pill to swallow and strongly supportive of the broad transformative work of the office and the city of Austin has rapidly transformed its access and mobility strategies and analysis and funding fasterrrr and better than any city in Texas. And the public works and corridors and you have brought us here, but there's a mistake in this matrix.

[4:00:22 PM]

And that's it. This is a lot of difficult nerd work, we're trying to have this posted today. So thank you. >> Question. >> Can you clarify, we have four pages here. And I'm just -- I want to understand what order this is in. >> Which -- >> Because the top statement and I'm not really sure how to read this or know how it was arranged. >> Sorry. >> There's no rankings on here. This was implement to be the same way the same document was for the other proposal. The things at the top, got the highest score. >> Page

one at the top, the highest scoring and I hit my 15th project and I have your top 15 the way you looking at it? >> Right, where it says full design and instruction on the right side would be adding up to 10 million. >> Alter: Above -- how much did you say. >> 410, which is the middle price estimate. >> Alter: And then it was -- airport to Maynor, and Guadalupe and -- what was the other one that you said? >> The other would be to include slaughter, I think there was a goal to make sure there was something for every corridor. >> Alter: Okay. If you could send my office a link when you have the material up. >> Uh-huh, yeah. >> Kitchen: Any other questions? Thank you. >> Thank you. >> Kitchen: Next is Hayden black walker. >> Good afternoon, I'm

[4:02:29 PM]

Hayden walker, I'll be brief because I know you guys have pretty much come to the conclusion on your own but I wanted to say as a citizen member of the transportation advisory council and the focus group put together for the corridors I've watched this project extensively and I would like to say kudos to staff for the work they've done. It's a demented set of projects obvious with -- a complicated set of projects with a lot of competing interests and I do go back to the contract with voters, it says a value statement which is critical and a vision that we have corridors that are livable, walkable, safe and transit supportive. And to promote health equity and complete communities. So I hear discussion in terms of additional and affordable housing on the corridorred and feel like there's a vision of creating places people can live and I envision a mother being able to table her 4-year-old by the hand and get on a bus, and in order to do that we have to make important choices about design speed. I was very flood to see the city manager's memo noting city staff will comply with -- or use the standards that are better than in the best and those standards called for maximum design to be 35 miles per hour which I think is really important to create a safe environment and have transit people can use. I guess the only other thing I would say, I noted the corridor plans reserve rights-of-way for places of future transit but we have a lot of transit on the ground today and talking about having them in place in six and a half years, it would be nice to support the transit we have out there today and doing everything we can to make sure that's successful as upon.

[4:04:30 PM]

And clearly, cap metro, you're working together and I think that the resolution you've put forward addresses that. So thank you very much. >> Kitchen: Thank you. So the last speaker, Josiah Stevenson, is he here? No. Okay, then I'll go back to the resolution that we have in front of us, are we ready to vote or is there any -- all right, did you have a -- >> I'm ready to vote, I no he staff has been working on this and there's been a tremendous amount of effort and very organized and I wanted to note, if it you wanted to make any comments beyond what was in the memo about the question about the -- linking. So that we could hear from you if you so choose at this time, I know you had a memo as well. >> Yeah, we provide a lot of the technical information there, we did share our methodology with the folks we worked with, one mentioned the analysis, the part of that focus group and had follow-up conversations

and staff stands by the methodology and we're happy to provide to remove the normalization aspect. And based on the contract with the voters we feel we did our best to into the prioritization model and use that and meet the objectives and goal set forth and happy to provide any additional information on that. >> Kitchen: Okay. We'll go ahead and take a vote on the resolution. All in favor, please say aye unanimous. The resolution passes and that will be a recommendation to council to take up next week when this item is in front of them. Now going to move to item number six, the 2018 bond

[4:06:31 PM]

program development. Including recommendations related to transportation. Who is our presenter for that? >> Me. >> Kitchen: Okay. Thank you. >> Thank you very much. Councilmembers. Pleasure to be here. Presented the entire package last week from the taskforce and today going to focus on transportation. The working group that I chaired. So first and foremost, I have a question, how much time do you have budgeted for me? Is there a time limit? I will modify my comments based on that. >> Kitchen: I would say 10 or 15 minutes, short is best. >> Staff has some slides as well. If you want them. This is the most important to hear from your advisor. And we have slides. >> Kitchen: I think that we're - you know, we're here to listen to the previous presentation so we appreciate that. So we can be quick in terms of the presentation or we can go straight to questions if people want to ask. Okay, about 10 minutes. Let me quickly go through the slides but I would like to add one overarching statement. We had community outreach meetings where we got feedback, etc., and consistent message I heard, I attended many of them, slowed the slides and etc., the consistent message I got from a lot of citizens is that they're confused between the 2016 wonder and what we're asking for the 2018 bond. So whatever you do as a -- as a subcommittee as well as city council and the city level, the message has to be very clear as to what we ask for in 2016 and what we're

[4:08:32 PM]

asking for in 2018. That confusion was persist. And I tried my best to clarify that, but I'm not sure that I achieved 100%. Okay? So let me quickly go through the slides. These are slides I presented last week, also but I want to go over them. So if I go to the first slide -- oh. Okay. This is essentially a consolidation of the different working groups and the last line item under transportation infrastructure is the one that I worked with several other members to create. In order -- that's the only one that came in less than what the city staff recommended. But that was not so much that we wanted to be below that number. It just started from the bottom up. We actually started on \$40 million and started counting up and more and more and more and sort of rest the at \$146 million and went back to the bangs and raised it up to \$180 million and the key difference between what the city came and recommended to us -- the what the city recommended and what we came up with, one is more signals and technology where the city recommended \$20 million and vision zero transportation safety again recommended \$20 million and we said \$15 million. And that was based on the feedback we got from city staff as to what would be a good sweet spot and felt that \$15 million was about the right number and \$20 million would be a stretch. So



we settled at 15 and it was \$10 million less than what the city recommended. The key point about those items, by the way, about signals and technology is

[4:10:33 PM]

that there's enough work to be done in the \$15 million, on top of the \$720 million from 2016, to keep them very, very busy for the next five, seven years. Okay? Also another item is that in sidewalk, we have when we heard the need for upgrading our existing sidewalks, the need is far greater than the \$20 million. 90% of the sidewalks are not complying with Ada requirements, we have a lot of work to do. So \$20 million is literally scratch can the surface. One item I wanted to focus on moving forward. See if I can get to the next one, those are the -- yeah, so in the area of vision zero, questions asked last week at the meeting and I wanted to emphasize what are the things we're talking about in vision zero, we're trying to get to zero fatalities. We are -- we -- I made some notes from my presentation to the taskforce. Is that things like major -- of the \$15 million, \$11 million supposed to go for major intersection safety projects and it's a toolkit of different things that were included in what we're trying to do. So in the area of intersections, it's pedestrians, street crossings, flashing lights, okay, slower speeds and the up in of things that they've studied as part of the toolkit that will enable the reduction of traffic fatalities. Is hit, at 20 miles per hour, nine out of 10 cases, the pedestrian will survive. At 30-miles, it's five out of 10 and 40-miles it's one out of 10. Okay? That's how important it is

[4:12:34 PM]

to manage speed at critical areas where the accident rates are higher. As you go forward, those are the statistics we got from the city staff that will be available as you come up with the actual budgets. So in conclusion, there was one statement made about traffic calming devices. It was a proposal that came from taskforce member that we voted on and approved and said that traffic calming devices, may only be added in the neighborhood only after a vote taken, within nine months of the completion of the project and the question was asked, who votes? I'll give you my own example. When we bought our house, there were no traffic calming devices. It was actually blocked from 360 and then opened it up to 360 and the speed -- actual speed went from 30 miles per hour the posted speed to where I called the police department to give tickets. I have a child. They'll track people driving 50, 55 miles per hour on our streets. We voted, everyone on our street, except one, voted in favor, but everyone else in the homeowner association voted against, it passed. They put the traffic bumps in there, but guess what, traffic became an obstacle course for young people and trucks. I'm not sure that it's a panacea, but it certainly reduces speed. >> Kitchen: Thank you. >> Question you said people in your neighborhood voted, you mean they signed a petition? >> Beg your pardon. >> Did you mean that they signed a petition?

[4:14:34 PM]

>> They approached the transportation department and came and spoke to the homeowners' association and said, ok, they wanted community feedback, so the homeowners' association called a meeting and we gathered there and took a vote. >> So the people who have the ability to attend that meeting were the eligible voters? >> Essentially. Those who attended voted and those who didn't didn't. >> Flannigan: I have many issues with that, the process and especially when talking about roads that may divide two homeowners' association or one road serving as a connector and the whole community not being part of that conversation. >> Concerns how that might not be effect or implemented in a consistent way across the areas where this may be true. >> Kitchen: Okay. Comments? >> Question. >> Kitchen: Go ahead. >> More for our transportation. Our bike lanes considered traffic calming devices, are they not? Okay, that's fine. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> I was curious what is considered traffic calming and the other question was -- I don't know -- is this killed as something to be put on the ballot or something that a councilmember would choose or something that -- >> If I may, the reason I interrupt, we're recommending this part of the program not be funded in the bond program because we're pulling back - - you know we're pulling back this whole program and looking at it again, the idea if this should be part of the program should be addressed but not in the bond program, in the address of that program itself. So we're recommending that the 500,000, the committee recommended to be included in the bond program would not go forward.

[4:16:36 PM]

So that -- this won't be a bond discussion, it will be a policy discussion on the program itself. >> From the standpoint of the taskforce, this was intended for the city council. >> Kitchen: Okay incident I would like to hear how you explain the differences in '16 and the ones include here. >> There's a wonderful slide that our city staff provided us. David provided to us, and shows the box, there, it's a four-box model, I don't have it in front of me but I can send it to you. It's a beautiful diagram and it shows very clearly the box that refers to the P. Bond, which is new capability and the 2018 bond which is primarily essentially refurbishment of existing infrastructure, like sidewalks and bridges, etc. >> Flannigan: So to staff, is -- is there -- if -- once we get more detail, I assume there will be more detail provided to council. The level, will -- do you have a sense of how much of this aligns with the way was explained of the \$180 million, how much of that winds up the way he describes it. >> We have a pretty extensive presentation to follow up with this to show you what the perceived overlap was '16, '18 and campo and we've got tables and it was also in the memo we put out. Trying to explain this very thing. There's some overlap on a couple of programs, for instance, the infrastructure program funded in '18 and -- the intersection program. >> Flannigan: I don't want to go over the whole thing

[4:18:37 PM]

right now. >> I have questions about that, but I'll read the memo first, basically that's what I'm wanting to understand, the overlap between the 2016 bond and the -- this proposed bond and then campo's funding. >> We've tried to explain that as much as we can. >> Kitchen: All right, I'll take a look and submit further questions if I have questions. >> Both the memo and the presentation we were ready to give you today, if you want it. If you look at both of those, I think that will answer your questions. >> Kitchen: The bottom line, there's some overlap, but that's detailed in what -- the information you put together. >> Forget, the corridor program, we may go in and -- for example, the corridor program, we may repair sidewalks but for moment issues. And 2018 is capital rule and reconstructing what needs to be reinstruct constructed. >> Kitchen: My main question was the signals. Campo put a huge -- not huge, but a big amount. >> We have that detail as well. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> Some of that in the 2016, some in campo, 2018, some parts of the signal project, that is not in either one of those. >> Kitchen: Did you have questions? >> I wanted to comment that in all of these case, the need far exceeds what was in the bond and so for the signals, I think it was something like \$71 million that they were asking for. And so the bond advisory taskforce allocated \$15 million and campo's -- I think campo is giving \$5 million. I don't know if that was a overlap with what they were asking for or not. As we're looking at this and

[4:20:38 PM]

looking at what compo presented it, I haven't seep the memo but saw the slides, really understanding there's a division that the 2016 mobility bond focused on very significant cleareds and doesn't cover the whole of the -- corridors and doesn't cover the whole of the city, and if we want to elsewhere off the corridors, the fund can mechanism we have is a bond and these are all needs that contribute to the mobility across the whole network. But I think that is highlighting of the challenge that was mentioned is important. I think it's going to be important in all of our bond propositions that we're communicating very clearly what they are about. In housing applanning, there was confusion over the rental assistance, where we give the rental subsidies but it's for the building of the houses that will be related and there's something that needs to happen in order to communicate and that's the same here as well. . >> Flannigan: Our need, for, for instance, in signals and everything signals is far more than 2018 bond and 2016 bond and campo combined. The at needs throughout the city that we would be looking to use this bucket of money for and local match also for campo, grants and we have to match those grants, and all of that together -- is just say yes. [Laughter] >> Kitchen: I heard that one. There are -- there's -- that's what makes this challenging, of course,. >> Sure. >> Kitchen: There are needs in all of these areas and definitely needs in transportation. So it's going to be -- as

[4:22:38 PM]

the council moves forward with figuring out what ends up on the bond, those things will be weighed. >> One last comment? >> Kitchen: Uh-huh. >> Since you're talk talking about traffic signals, I have a example that is telling. I was driving to the outreach meeting in district 4 and came down the hill and stopped at the traffic light on 360 and a fire engine came down trying to respond to something across

360 and I timed it, see how long it takes. It took them 32 seconds to get through the intersection. Because it just couldn't turn the light green. >> Kitchen: Uh-huh, that's a good story for us to remember. So -- I have -- I have a resolution for the committee to consider. And so I'll lay that out and again, as we did before, we have a few speakers. So basically what this is is by way of background, this relates to project connect and moving forward with high capacity transit. Cap metro passed -- cap metro board passed a resolution to request that the city consider -- the city council consider placing up to \$15 million in funding in the bond package to be used to match cap metro funding for supporting preliminary engineering and environmental analysis for the priority projects that emerge out of project connect and when I say matching, cap metro has identified dollars to put in in connection for the -- in addition for the next phase of project connect. The second thing included in

[4:24:39 PM]

the cap metro resolution was the recognition of the importance of the equity, the transit equity corridors we discussed a little bit earlier, pleasant valley in particular. And the importance of working to identify how to -- how to address those -- the ray infrastructure gap on pleasant valley. Cap metro, the city of Austin help in terms of figuring out where we might have funding to address that gap because we'll not be able to consider that corridor as a -- down the road as a corridor in southeast Austin for high capacity transit until we address that gap issue. So -- and we know, for example, that was an item that was the city submitted to campo for funding. It wasn't funded this time. But there was conversation with the campo staff how it might be funded in the future and what action that the city could perhaps take in the meantime that would be helpful in getting it funded in the future. There's more conversation to be had about pleasant valley. The resolution I'm bringing forward has two be it resolved of the first that the -- resolved question the \$15 million in funding to include it in the bond package as requested which the cap metro board and the second is that the city manager is directed by city council to identify funding to be allocated to support the development of transit equity corridors as requested by the cap metro board and again, again, that direction is to help identify funding, it's not to include that necessarily on the bond package. So I would like to make a

[4:26:42 PM]

motion that the mobility committee pass this recommendation to council. Do I have a second? Second. Councilmember Garza. Is it okay if we hear from our speakers? We have two speakers. Kathie and sinobia. >> Councilmembers thank you for your time. I'm Kathie, chair of the board of vision zero. And cofounder of central Texas families for safe streets. Vision zero envisions Austin with zero deaths or incapacitating injuries. And it's a peer-to-peer network for families who are victims of traffic violence. I was called to this work after nigh 9-year-old nephew in September of 2016, he suffered among other injuries, a severe brain injury, an update on his condition, requires 24 hour care and got home from the hospital after pneumonia. I have learned this type of devastation has affected families across Austin differently. Statistically affect people of color more frequently than whites. And cars are less likely to

slow down when a person of color steps off the curb than when a white person does. Financially traffic victims often lose their jobs and doesn't have insurance, it could completely ruin them. It's not just mobility funding, it's safe, access funding, all of our citizens deserve access to parks and

[4:28:43 PM]

schools and housing and everything that this great city has to offer and should not be hampered by people not being able to safely across the road. Recent study on intersections has produced good results in reducing crashes according to the analysis. Proposed \$35 million to be included in the 2018 bond, 15 to further fund the vision Austin -- vision zero Austin program and continue to work with the goals, the proposal was for \$26 million for vision zero to be included the bond. The people of Austin have desires that should be funded and would like to request that the city council send it to the voters, the full amount for the programs. >> Kitchen: Thank you. Ms. Joseph. >> Thank you, I wanted to headache a few comment, councilmember kitchen, as it relates to your resolution, specifically the 2016 mobility bond, I'm concerned about the transit -- transportation corridor, \$66.8 million is specified online and I just wanted to know how flexible the bond committed projects are to changing specifically interested in pedestrian high way beacons at Cramer station, it's Cramer but actually chinatown, the 801 bus rapid transit southbound and I wanted to thank you specifically for the sidewalks that we now have on the southbound side, on the northbound side, it's still not compliant, there's about a 12-inch groove, if you will, for people to walk with rocks embedded but

[4:30:44 PM]

still gets pretty muddy, if you could check to see where that is on the prioritization list and I wanted to ask as well as it relates to the sixth where as, you specify transit corridors, I'm not sure what is meant by that. >> Kitchen: Go ahead and then I'll answer your question. >> Certainly, I wanted to ask you if it's possible to specify the northern corridors, specifically Parma lane, I've don'ted for transit in that area and though it's in the service area, I do believe if it's not specified in it will -- in the resolution, it will be ignored and there's history of it and dropped off the radar and there's growth between Samsung and del, and 'M will move their headquarters there as well. And I wonder if it's possible to specify, to add northern corridor, if that's possible. And I echo the sentiments of lady who just spoke, all too often individuals cross mid block and call your attention to the 2009 Texas institute study that specified the fatalitance it's dangerous, all I can say is without cap metro actually making that a time point, what happens is route 392, the Braker lane bus which operates from tech ridge park-and-ride to the -- it's a super target there. What I want you to understand, the bus arrives at Braker, individuals want to wait patiently, the 801 southbound is inbound and trying to get to work, it's

[4:32:47 PM]

a 20 minute interval in between. And that's where most of the fatalities occur and if you have questions, I'll gladly answer them at this time. >> Kitchen: Thank you, I'd like to turn to our staff. Oh, I -- the other speaker? Okay. Ms. Joseph, we're going to turn to Jay Crossly. For staff, I know one of her questions related to the specifics along the north corridor and I know there's going to be a public process to looking at the specifics. We'll get to that that minute. We'll go to Mr. Crossly. >> Thank you for your time. I just -- showed up late after the discussion here, I wanted to strongly advocate for the full \$26 million proposed by acd for vision zero. We're in a traffic death epidemic, our state leads the country, 10 people die every day in the state. In the Austin region, every day, four people die or suffer incapacitating life long injuries, every single day. The scale of the problem we're up against is more than most of us can understand in our daily life and Austin has been leading solving this problem, for the state. And two out of four of you voted back in 2006 to develop a speed management strategy. To start making our streets safer by having safe speeds as was explained for everyone. I have been working with the state on the strategy highway safety plan and txdot and how to spread the good work what Austin has been doing and everyone is receptive and it's

[4:34:47 PM]

devastating to hear that's possibly stalled here and lots of people die everywhere but people have children who walk or bike, the vast majority of children who die or seriously injured while walking or biking are on the neighborhood streets and leaving our neighborhood streets at these high speeds, as I parent of a 4-year-old, this is the nightmare. Scared to let our kids play in a neighborhood, like I did growing up in Houston and I don't know of something that's a higher priority. And so I just hope that you will reconsider and fully fund what the obvious transportation department is ready to do with vision zero as soon as possible. Thank you. >> Kitchen: A couple of comments. First off, this committee is not making any comment on the -- the breath of the transportation bond. At this point. So with regard to vision zero, I have not suggested for any of my colleagues suggested we reduce the amount. So I want to be clear on that. The only -- the only focus of this particular resolution is just to, one, doesn't involve any -- any cutting or reducing what is proposed to us, only speaks related to the -- to the next steps for project connect. Planning. There will be a lot more discussions at council about the entire budget, the entire bond proposal, transportation, the whole range and so I'm not -- I'm not bringing forward any motion that speaks to those conversations. So I would say as an aside, that I think that I recognize the importance of vision zero. And the importance of all of

[4:36:48 PM]

our transportation items being brought forward. And also I wanted to comment on, Mr. Good, can you comment on the process, I understand there's a public nut process. I think -- a public input process. >> Sure. >> Kitchen: That gets down to the details, can you speak to that? >> As we move forward with the

full design on every corridor, we'll work with -- for push input what is required, what's needed in those corridors and take that input. >> Kitchen: So there's a opportunity, if you could pass along to the appropriate people. Out a resolution and a motion and second. Do we have any conversation about it? Anyone want to say anything? >> Yeah, I'm not going to support the resolution, I'm struggling with the very complicated trade-off conversation about the bond and -- >> Kitchen: Right. >> Flannigan: And not comfortable endorsing \$15 million of the bond in this way right now. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> Flannigan: I might be fine when we're having are the conversation at full council. >> Kitchen: Okay, any other questions or conversation? >> I have questions for cap metro. Generally am supporting our transit but I do need you to help me understand what the \$15 million would be for. One, and then, two, why was it in your long range plans to fund it outside of the city, or, you know, there seems to be there were opportunities with the county bond, the mobility bond and you have your on

[4:38:50 PM]

funding capacity. Why put it in our bond now and these might have been questions I might have asked you otherwise in this setting but we just got our agenda and stuff, and so before I can really think about this resolution I need answers to those questions. >> From cap metro. The answer to the first question, as mentioned we have the 11 high capacity transit corridor identified in the coming months and we'll be request prioritizing those and so we do not have the exact corridors that believe be funded at this point in time and, therefore, the ask was -- was essentially more general than that, it will be components of project connect that are identified in the public process we have underway right now and as approved by our board in the coming months and so there was somewhat of a timing mismatch. Ideally we would have had perfect information and the work done but we're not there yet and we didn't want to presuppose and short circuit the process but at the same time, it was a need identified, we have -- as any governmental agency, I'm sure, have lots of things on our to-do list and limited amounts of resources and we saw this as an opportunity because the bulk of the corridors are within the city of Austin. And so the approach we took was -- and our board took as well, was cap metro writes some resources to the table to move these projects forward and again, it's preliminary engineering and environmental work that's critical to move the overall effort forward for those corridors moving forward in the first phase. The city, we asked for some assistance there and also had discussion was Travis county about funding from

[4:40:51 PM]

that entity as well. So we're taking this as a regional investment and regional program and that partnerships are essential to move forward. >> Alter: Did you apply to campo for this money? >> We considered that and actually talked to the city staff about that and ultimately decided against that. Partly because of limited amount of funding available for transit-specific projects and a number of other factors. >> Alter: Um -- so in terms of the project being funded, I understand there's a mismatch on the timing, and, obviously, cap metro is regional in focus, a little bit concerned about going to the voters and

not having a sense of the geographic scope. I know it's been seen in a lot greater detail but I got this yesterday. Help me understanding how that interfaces because the regional project connect and regional city money from the city of Austin and city of Austin funding, the whole regional project without resources from elsewhere, commitment from that, makes me a little bit uncomfortable. Without having a larger -- I don't have the larger background on the funding mechanisms for cap metro in the way I have more knowledge of campo, so help me with that. >> All right, and again, we do anticipate multiple funding sources to move project connect forward. And with regard to the first part of the question, about specificity and in advance of a potential vote in November of this year, we will likely be through the board process by -- on or about that time and

[4:42:52 PM]

definitely have much more information. The other thing, as Eric just reminded me, we don't have the bonding ability the same as the city does. So that's a factor as well in terms of revenue sources that were available. But we, again, understand the questions, I think they're rose bowl questions and we appreciate your -- they're reasonable questions and we appreciate your consideration. >> Kitchen: I understand those questions with regard to the region, I think that what I have in mind from -- with my city hat on, is the -- and I've been thinking of this in terms of we've identified three corridors most likely, now we have to -- likely, but we have to go through the public process before decisions are made but three corridors that have the top priority all of which are within the city of Austin, the north Lamar, the south congress and river side. >> Yes, ma'am. >> Kitchen: And my thought had been and I didn't is check this with you, but my thought had been our next stage of studies welcome focused on whatever we identify as the next priority and it's certainly something as a city councilmember, I -- with city funds happy to be specific with that. But I -- about that. But the reason I brought this forward, because cap metro does not have bonding authority and because there's a direct overlap between the responsibilities of cap metro and the city for transportation solutions and because high capacity transit is so necessary, for us to be able to move forward, so to my mind, my reasoning for bringing this forward is that it the city and cap metro need to work hand in hand in terms of how we plan and also in terms of

[4:44:53 PM]

how we put forward funding and in my mind, also \$15 million is -- is a necessary -- well, you know, we have to have funding from somewhere in order to take the next step. You know, if we don't have the funding from somewhere to take the next step on the planning for high capacity transit, then that's -- capacity transit then it's a no go and cap metro sources of funding are incredibly limited and we have dollars that will be put in from cap metro but the money is not there to fund the whole thing so it made sense to me, as well as going to other partners for funding, particularly for these three sort of high priority projects within this project it makes sense. And the other thing, there's such an overlap between the corridor construction program and this, you know, we're not -- you know, it would have been better perhaps if we had thought during the 2016 mobility bond when we put that on the bond package, it



would have been really ideal to put dollars in there for planning because these are the same corridors. So -- but we're not there, that's past and done, so we have a bond package in front of us and it's just a opportunity. I wanted to explain where I was coming from. >> Alter: I appreciate all of that, I may well be very excited with this in the bond process, but I'm not feeling today, I can endorse, if we move to vote but it's no the because I don't believe in transit, I think we have to make the investment but I've not had the time to do due diligence how to put Thissen withins transportation infrastructure and the other sources of funding and other opportunities and just the wider picture of exactly how

[4:46:55 PM]

cap metro is funded. And it's really a matter of sort of timing and you and I can have a conversation as we get years to the next meeting before voting on the bond and maybe I'll have the time to do the due diligence because it's very much something that, um -- I would find it very -- be sympathetic toward it, I just am not comfortable making that decision today without more information. >> Without the \$15 million, the idea of these three corridors on a 2020 bond, can you explain what that would mean? >> Sure, I mean, this is considered a critical part of our overall path forward and without having perfect a possible outcome is we have to scale down the initial component of project connect, if we can't develop the project sufficiently as I mentioned in the earlier part of the presentation, to understand the environmental impacts and the very things you've heard Robert speak to with regard to what you deal with in preliminary engineering, without having that details to answer the public's questions about it, when you're asking for funding, it makes it a lot less viable to move forward with the projects, so the size of the funding we have for preliminary engineering and environmental, will directly relate to the size of the program we're able to carry forward in a potential 2020 referendum. >> Kitchen: Okay, so you think it's a critical -- these are -- it's a critical piece for the three corridors.

[4:48:57 PM]

>> Alter: And I understand -- you know, as you point out councilmember kitchen and I have been involved in conversations as members of the cap metro board and I understand the reluctance to -- if we're not clear about that, but I think -- I think this is a opportunity to extend sending a message that we as a city understand the transportation and congestion issues that our city is facing and we have to make big investments and big changes and we can't do that, at the capital board meeting but one agency at a time and work together to solve these very complicated issues and cap metro does not have the ability to put its own bond on the -- on a ballot and just the first step in a lot of discussions. And I think we -- we as the ones, you know, trying to solve these big issues for our community, it's important for the community to know that this is a big step we're willing to take. If it doesn't seem we have the support, you know, there's time to gain that, but I guess I had hoped we were moving in a different direction as we go into a possible rail measure that many in the city have been wanting and supporting and I think, you know, the reason the last one failed is rail people against rail people, which is interesting. But, um -- yeah, I guess -- >> Kitchen: And I understand my colleagues wants to spend more

time, but as councilmember Garza said, this is a statement we need to make as a city. \$15 million is really pretty small in the -- in the order

[4:50:59 PM]

of magnitude of what we're talking about for the whole bond and we're also asking the public to vote and my resolution doesn't say it has to be in transportation, it doesn't say we have to cut anything -- it makes no -- I'm not trying to -- there's a lot of conversation that has to happen about the whole package, including I know some of my colleagues are concerned about, you know, how much are we talking about putting on this bond in terms of the impact on the voters? This is silent as to all of that. It's just making a statement about the importance of moving forward with high capacity transit, about the necessity to move it forward requires a partnership between the city and makes a statement now early on in the process while we go and ask all of the other bodies to stand with us on this, so with that said, I'd like to take a vote and I respect my colleagues if they feel they need more time. >> Alter: I'm happy to take a vote if you want to take a vote today, but again, I'm that -- >> Kitchen: That's okay. >> Alter: I think this was not vetted through the bond election advisory taskforce in any way, and so I just -- I need more time to look at it. I'd be happy to return to it in June when we have more information and happy to spend the time with others to learn what I need to on that. You know, I don't want abstaining to be bad as a no vote on transit, that's not what it is, but I have to understand the answers to these questions and given the time and when we got backup and other stuff, I haven't been able to do that due diligence. >> Kitchen: Like I said, I respect whatever decision my colleagues want to make at this point. I just think it's important to make a statement. I don't know if we'll get

[4:52:59 PM]

another chance as a committee. Go ahead. >> Flannigan: I'm in support conceptually and I might support this in the end anyway, does it change the intent of your resolution if it's, instead of city council, includes the requested, city council consider including? >> Kitchen: I would be -- >> Flannigan: I'm willing to support that. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> Flannigan: That word, tell can the council to include this on the list of items to debate. That's something I'm willing to support. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> Garza: I would also like to modify the second be it further resolved, because I don't know what iniquity -- an equity transit corridor means. >> Kitchen: It refers back up -- to explain, it's -- all of this is referring to the -- a resolution that cap metro passed and so the whereas, the last whereas, is what it's intended to refer to, which is pleasant valley. Now, one of our speakers referred to Parmer, that's not something that we've talked about yet but this was designed to speak specifically to pleasant valley. So that's what the second piece was about. And if you -- and that's why I said, as requested, when it says as requested by the cap metro board of directors, it's meant to refer to that resolution. So -- I could be more specific if you would like. >> Historically, east Austin has been left out of conversations about improving infrastructure and improving -- you know, having basic amenities and the green line -- I don't want to speak for cap metro but they labeled that an

[4:55:01 PM]

equity corridor because of the opportunity, it doesn't face the same -- well, it depends on how you compare the two. It's connected as -- as pleasant valley is not. Pleasant valley has long been on a discussion of connecting that and the need to connect that. And so as we were having these discussions at cap metro, it was discussed that, you know, there's opportunities for equity corridors in other parts of Austin as well and south pleasant valley has always been in consideration as one of those and so that's just a word that was added frankly, equity is the word right now. So that's how that -- >> Kitchen: Would you be more comfortable if it was specified? >> Alter: I'm trying to make a suggestion similar to what councilmember Flannigan had said so that the council consider directing the city manager to do that and again we can come back at another time and look more specifically but I have -- I don't have any idea what that costs, whatever, the committee recommends that city council consider asking the city manager to identify funding or some other language like that. >> Kitchen: Okay, uh-huh. >> Alter: I -- I would not want to be in the way of advancing the conversation, it's clearly a confidence with he need to be -- a conversation we need to be having and I would be comfortable with that modification. >> Kitchen: All right, we'll make that modification, any other conversation? All in favor. Okay. Thank you. >> For the sake of the minutes could you read what the resolution. >> Kitchen: The first be it resolved, that the committee

[4:57:03 PM]

recommend city council consider including the requested \$15 million and second one, that the city manager consider directing -- wait, let's see -- that the committee recommends that the city manager consider directing -- no. No, I'm sorry. >> I said that the committee -- I was trying to figure it out. The committee recommends that the city council consider directing the city manager to identify -- >> Yeah, yeah. So it's parallel. Okay. All right. >> Thank you. >> Thank you. >> Did you want pleasant valley specified in there. >> Kitchen: At this point. All right, okay. We'll now move on to -- we'll now move on to item number 7. Which is the dockless mobility systems. >> Three minutes till 5:00. >> Kitchen: Okay. Moving fast. >> Lightning round. >> Kitchen: Sorry. [Various speakers]. >> If you're ready? I'm with the transportation department? I'm with the transportation department? I'm with the transportation department? I'm here to introduce you to Jason Michael and we're here to talk about dockless mobility here in town. >> So the presentation is up. Hello, again, Jason John Michael, assistant director of -- [indiscernible] Madam chairperson, councilmembers of the committee, thank you for your time and service. I'll get right to it. As you're aware, there is a -- we have a process that was approved by council associated with moving forward with a dockless bicycle program and pilot. In the midst of launching that pilot two weeks ago, one vendor

[4:59:03 PM]

decided to go ahead and launch in the city. And so that's in essence sped up and somewhat altered the plans that were agreed upon related to that -- that resolution. So first of all, I wanted to get out exactly what we're talking about here today, it's not just bikes, it's not just scooters. Dockless mobility is a new advent to personal mobility in the mobility landscape. And unfortunately, these are just two modes. Other things such as dockless personal autonomous pods as well as dockless car rental are just around the corner. These are being piloted in other countries currently. And so as part of what we wanted to do, we wanted to inform the mobility committee that what exactly it means to be a dockless mobility system. So, those are whether they use smart phone apps to unlock these devices, vehicles, they can be used -- usually for the last mile. And then -- then they're allowed to be able to put up anywhere, left anywhere. The bicycles and scooters aren't new to this it's just the technology and how that technology is making the connections between people who want rides and providers that can give them. The city sees these devices as an opportunity for a short trip, last mile travel solutions. We definitely see this as part of the overall mobility landscape in Austin. Henceforth with the pilot that we had, with the advent of the introduction of the scooters, it's brought about a level of an understanding between what are the pros and cons related to the dockless mobility. So while there are -- they're great for short trip and you can just read across on this. While they're great for short trips, what we deemed as the

[5:01:04 PM]

last foot is where there's a big issue. It's what happens in the last part of the trip and how these devices are left on the sidewalk that either impede mobility, create trip hazards, impede ADA access, or even worse, occlude egress of a building for fire. More of these vehicles are in the market for residents' use. The -- the business models are to saturate the marketplace with these devices so that they're all over the place, so it makes it easy for people to use them. But in that, also, as you've seen in your own investigations, probably, on-line, that there's quite a lot of possibilities for things to be left inappropriately in our -- in our right of way space. These give a great opportunity for communities of need that's been something from an equity standpoint that's been resonated throughout today's meeting. I would say this gives an opportunity for some people to have full-on trip progression with this in these, in these communities of need. They might not even need another mode is what I'm saying. This could be their primary mode of travel. As I said before, these are not smart phone enabled but from an equity standpoint, not everyone has that. So how do we handle that? These are all obviously things that we've been talking about related to the pilot program that we are now advancing in a little bit of a hurried pace. These nests that they put on private property is where the trips start in the beginning in the morning. But obviously if you're going to look at the mode of operation, those move around the city throughout the day. Then they're picked up at night because they need to be charged and then more importantly, some of them don't have reflectors or the ability to be safely used at night in low visibility. >> Wouldn't be picked up at night. >> That's true. And some the -- some business models leave them out on the street and wait for full depletion before they will then

[5:03:05 PM]

pick them up and charge them. Other business models don't even look at -- don't even address how you recharge them. So it begins to make you wonder if they're going to pick them up at all. The free market approach to this mobility solution delivers uncertain impacts to the established dock system as well as the safety and mobility of everybody on the street. These scooters and bikes are perceived to be fun and healthy through peer review we've done with other cities, we've learned that since there's no specific age requirement, then certain young persons are finding ways to, I think a gentleman said, get their butts out of the seat. So very similar, they're finding ways to get very aggressive as how they use these devices more in a Tony Hawk fashion than using them as personal mobility. All of these things can be overcome and would have been overcome with our pilot program. It's all about proper education and the people who are using these devices. Alternatively, reliable single occupant vehicle trips can be completely occluded and if you can think about how S.O.B.S are used in the city currently for trips, this could remove a lot of those off of the road and ultimately that lowers our overall carbon footprint as well. So, I mentioned earlier when some of the other things were happening in other cities. What's happening in Austin is in the magnitude of hundreds right now. What we're seeing in other cities are getting up to the thousands. And this is thousands per vendor. So right now we have about -- we'll get to it in a minute, but we have over ten vendors who are ready to operate in Austin. Customers that pick these up and drop them off, they can do that wherever they want. These -- most of these places that we went to and asked for a little bit of peer review in

[5:05:07 PM]

exchange of lessons learned were finding out that most of it is taking advantage of outdated ordinances related to in the right of way or any other type of mobility as a service that doesn't fit into a service that doesn't fit into a road or existing ordinance relating to transportation or mobility as a service. These private companies are not very reactive to managing their fleets. Some are. Some have better technology to do that than others. But at the end of the day, it is about saturation. We as a city as well as our sister cities are scrambling to find ways to make sure that we maintain the level of safety first out there. And then ultimately find ways that we can inform -- inform you to be able to understand how we need to move forward with the right business process and the right business ecosystem to be able to take advantage of this. And then lastly, I'll say that, you know, the lack of parking or education around that last foot is what's really causing the issue. That can be overcome and we can find ways to accomplish that in a transparent way through that -- the pilot program. So, what's happening here? As I mentioned before, the first -- the first system or system launch was February 1. That -- that was followed through the Tripoli green week two weeks ago with the launch of a public process. Obviously that launched the listening sessions that we've had. We had two listening sessions. We had two more scheduled before council. 14 companies are currently working in some capacity with the city. Two of those companies have decided to go ahead and deploy. And knowing that there is a pilot process and a transparent pilot process in place.

[5:07:12 PM]

These abandoned or parked vehicles as I said before, they're creating safety hazards as you can see in the picture there. This particular unit can easily be considered a tripping hazard. Currently right now, our taxpayers are bearing the cost of this in safety enforcement because, again, as I said earlier, we don't have the right ordinances in place to be able to manage this new business. I'll just finish on this slide by saying that we want to continue the community engagement process. Because of what's happening, it's causing us to react. But it doesn't mean that we need to stop. The transparent process that we planned on doing. All we really need to do is find a way to correctly enforce so that it's safe now. And then through this process and this ordinance, use that as a means to -- to manage the outcomes of the pilot. I would say that the idea of a pilot at this point is a little germane because we have operators that are operating in town. I'd like to find a way to get those onboard and to the pilot programs and I think the ordinance is a way to do that. Quickly, just a couple of other pictures kind of drive home some of the safety and ADA issues. This is in DC. This is a very easy to understand how someone who is visually impaired would have issues with this. Obviously, wheelchair-bound people as well would have issues. During the enforcement activities over the last two weeks, we did find units that were left out at night. Some of them occlude ADA ramps. One particular instance occluded the ADA ramp as well as occluding the access to the ADA handrail which means wheelchair bound citizens but walking ADA citizens like myself would also not be able to use that

[5:09:13 PM]

handrail. The next picture is one in San Francisco. This is a very common occurrence that we're seeing in Austin right now where obviously there are -- there are destinations in town that a lot of people would use to get there. When we get to these locations, we're seeing these units in awkward and happen has hard format. My officer, park enforcement officers doing the operation witnessed the residents walking down the sidewalk where one had fallen over, reached down, kind of haphazardly to pick it up and put it against the building wall. But they're on their -- they have their own agenda, you know? And they may be busy. They may not have spent the time to do it correctly. And only to have that unit fall back down right in front of someone who is walking behind them. So how these things are put up in the last foot is critical to everyone's safety out there. And to that end, we can't have something happened where we were hurting somebody, right? So what are the other cities doing? And how do we -- how did we use that information to better inform you on how we need to move forward? In Santa Monica, I'm not going to belabor all of these, but as you can see, with the different legislation, these are the west coast and Dallas, I've seen most of this. I will say that it is moving across the United States in a tidal wave kind of fashion. DC and Dallas being the two theish -- the two other cities. From a cost perspective, it's kind of all over the board. You may ask why is it all over the board? I think that's because no one really quite understands yet exactly what the total costs of some of this stuff is going to be. So you're seeing license fees like in Seattle of \$149. Then in San Francisco, over \$10,000.

[5:11:14 PM]

When you look in the data, though, it's interesting because some -- some costs and fee structures are associated with the companies. And then others are associated with the device. This is a key piece. These companies, these operators, I'll say, they're typically not one company. Sometimes there's an infrastructure owner who owns the device. But then the owner of the app and the solution is different. So you have two businesses that are operating as one. So in that essence, if you're just structuring all of the evidence around the device and not looking at the technology, then we're only handling half of the problem. So it's important for us to look at both the technology, because that's the pervasive part, right? The scooter has been around for a while. The bike has been around for a while. It's the technology and how the technology is connecting people in rides and how we need to better understand how to manage that business process. So moving forward, some recommended actions for the committee to take into consideration. Obviously tighten up our current right of way code. We've been working with assistant city attorneys on getting that ready. Accelerated permitting system to legalize and create the business environment in order for the city to properly manage the operators in town as well as any other operators that want to come to town. With that is you'll see in the bulleted list are some details related to some recommended details related to that -- to that code. That would include a permanent fee for the device. They each get a permit. The number is actually the serial number of the bikes, figured that was the easier way to go rather than us

[5:13:16 PM]

creating our own numbering system when the units themselves have an individual number already. Operators then need to maintain safety, carry insurance, normal things that we ask businesses to do when they're operating in the rider lane. This would require them to reposition equipment as needed so there's a level of balance, so there's not these big piles of devices in one area of town. Then we got into better understanding of what some of the incentives might be in order to make sure that there was a level across town as well. As I mention earlier, one of the bullets that's not listed here in the presentation is the difference of understanding what we're enforcing on devices versus what we're enforcing on technology. As far as how we do this last one, there's some things that's happening in other cities in a we take note of and see how that might be used here in the city of Austin. That is related to the last -- the last one and the safety around that. And then how we enforce making sure that that is put in the correct place. So when you look at what's happening in places like Seattle, they're creating these painted bike boxes. So these are through proper community involvement and dedication, it's understood that if you're using one of these dockless mobility solutions that when you're done with your trip, it's not docked, but you can very easily and appropriately put it in one of these boxes. I would say that this is the current means and method. We're seeing technologies that use gps and geofencing, be able to create the same box and use the haptic response that are on a lot of the scooters, particularly the scoot kerrs, they buzz, vibrate, ding at you,

[5:15:17 PM]

whatever. There's ways to work with the providers of this technology to allow both us and their customers to properly manage these in a correct way. The -- the ordinance that when he ear looking at is focused on making sure that there is some level of equity as I mentioned before. So we've used the downtown Austin coordination protection zone as a means to create that -- that map and that geographic understanding of what some of our requirements would be. And as you can see there, I think everyone here is aware of that area. I probably am less of that since I'm new. But from the east and to the west. Oltorf from the south and -- from the north. Why are we here today? Well, we're here because we have some actors in town that I believe are creating a safety issue that needs to be addressed. We need an authorized process to establish the business environment related to how these devices are being use canned. -- Are being used. The biggest issue is how they're put up. In the end of the day, we're probably not going to get everyone to put them up correctly. So if the company cannot ensure that they can -- that their customers can put them up correctly, who's responsibility is it to make sure that the safety of everyone out there is protected? I believe that through this process, it would create the business environment such that the taxpayers do not have to bear this cost to maintain safety on the sidewalks, that it can be borne by the private companies that are operating in town. Up, I also like to point out that the companies that have been a part of this process, this open process to date, that have not launched. I want to publicly say thank you

[5:17:19 PM]

to those companies because they quite honestly understand Austin. Austin is different. And we believe in having an open and public process and I believe that those companies are respectful of that. And they should be at least publicly acknowledged that they've done so. The -- the folks that have launched prematurely have created costs for the city. These costs, I am calculating -- tracking so we can understand what the costs are at the end of the day and what's -- what's a legal business environment is created. Additionally, the level of community involvement and the transparent process in having to move forward, we still want to gather the data, we want to do all of the things we planned in the pilot. We just need to find a way to move forward from this point. So, our next steps the, we've briefed you today. We'd like to seek a right of way ordinance, cleanup for next week. And work with the operators on a permitted system rollout that would begin sometime around may 1. With that, we would inform the community through our -- our post, the listening sessions as we said earlier, two of those coming up. We would not use those to inform them until we had action from mayor and council. We would inform the community on changes assuming that happens and begin to permit these things and monitor their performance and report that back to the committee. And that's the end of my presentation. >> Okay, colleagues. I'm sure we have questions. So we also have a few speakers. Would you all like to take questions or speakers first? Do you have a preference? >> Speakers. >> Kitchen: Let's go ahead and take the speakers. Speakers, because we are tight on time, I would ask you to try to speak in less than three



[5:19:20 PM]

minutes if you can. So, we'll start with Matt Shaw and then -- we'll have one person speaking and the next person geared up. So the next person is Nick. And, Nick, I cannot pronounce your last name. So Nick, if you want to come up so that you're ready when -- when Matt finishes? >> Thank you. Madam chair, committee members, thank you for the opportunity to speak with you this afternoon. My name is Matt Shaw. I'm the director of government relations at Burke. Let me start by saying we're excited to be here in Austin, we love the city, the people, and helping the city get people out of cars and on to safe reliable electric scooters. I would begin by sharing some data. Then launch a small demonstration pilot in east Austin on south congress on April 6. In the two weeks we've been legally operating here in Austin, 5,000 people have tried it out. They've ridden over 20,000 miles and our network of chargers has earned 25,000 charging birds. If you annualize those numbers, austinites will ride more than \$600,000 miles and earn \$800,000 in charging revenue, that's based on a small number of vehicles. We're excited to bring affordable, sustainable, and convenient last mile and first mile transportation to Austin. Before I address the draft ordinance that Jason mentioned that's on the council agenda for next week, I want to speak about Mr. Spiller's memo. Yesterday proposes a regulatory framework that includes electric scooters. I want to say we work with transportation departments in many cities and we're impressed with the transportation folks we met here in Austin, we appreciate the work the mobility team is doing and enjoyed, the positive conversations we've had with the team over the last couple of weeks. So we like a lot of what's laid out in Mr. Spiller's memo. One thing we ask you and the

[5:21:21 PM]

city staff to consider is what we call smart scale canning. Instead of the hard cap of 500 vehicles as is currently proposed. When we launch, we start with a relatively small number of vehicles and we only have scooters if the scooters are getting three or more rides a day. So we can determine the exact number of scooters at the right place at the right time so we can maximize ride efficiency and make sure we don't have too many scooters out on your streets. One of the things we've learned about hard caps is when you cap the number, is when you cap them, it continues to be parts to be underserved. If you scale up smart scaling, it helps to serve underserved areas. In addition to the smart scaling, we like the framework and we're excited to work on the mobility team in finalizing a pilot program that includes scooters. Regarding the draft ordinance, we have a couple of things that we would ask you to consider. First we think there might be unintended consequences of the language, as it relates to food vendors and other sidewalk activities. We think the ordinance in its current form may affect some things that you don't intend or weren't originally intended. Second, if the ordinance is adopted as it is, it will shut down operations in Austin between the time the ordinance takes effect and the may 1 date referencing Mr. Spiller's memo. We simply ask that you -- [buzzer] >> Kitchen: If you could just wrap up your thoughts. >> I have two more paragraphs, sorry. >> Kitchen: No, not two paragraphs, one sentence. So -- >> Thank you so much for your time and consideration. >> Kitchen: Okay, thank you. After Nick will be Michael

shram. So, Michael, you can come up. And, Nick, Nick you can go ahead. >> Thank you for giving me a chance to voice my opinion today. My name is Nick Zienka. I live on West Gate and Stasney, Madam Chair, I'm a constituent

[5:23:21 PM]

of your district. I'm here speaking on behalf of the bird charger community. I'm having a great time working for this company. They give me a great opportunity to make supplemental income in my spare time. An hour in the morning and hour at night to make some money. I pick up 10 to 30 birds in my truck. I breed chickens and have a dog sitting business with my girlfriend. This is phenomenal. I've been able to fix the wheel bearing in my truck. I added brakes when I was at it. I bought a new vacuum cleaner because our dog sitting business does a number to our carpets there. And, you know, I've had a great time. Really easy to work with. I go out every morning, wake up at 5:00 now to go put out the birds. I go out at 8:00 or before then to go grab a few high numbers, sometimes \$20 a bird. I look for those for sure because I need some money in this market starting two businesses right now. And, you know, I'm just here to say that I'm all for this. And I think that our community here in Austin, you know, we appreciate these kinds of things. We're a unique small city. Forward thinking, Progressive. It kind of fits in -- fits in here. We have the festivals and the concerts and the good times. People see that. People up and down on the streets having big smiles on the birds. They enjoy it. People like to see people having fun in town visiting or ACL or what have you, a business trip. I think it's important for us to be different and stand out to the rest of Texas and have people have the opportunities to have jobs like this where they can make extra money in their spare time. Yeah, so that's all I had to say. >>. >> Kitchen: Thank you, thank you very much. >> Thank you for letting me speak. I appreciate it. >> Kitchen: Thank you. After Michael, we'll have Brian now. So if you want to come sit up here. Go ahead, Michael. >> First off, I appreciate you guys allowing me to come and talk to you guys a little bit.

[5:25:25 PM]

I want to give you guys a different face to think about when you draft the rules and regulations. I'm the co-founder of another dockless scooter company here in Austin, third generation Austinite. I live in district 7. And just been in Austin my whole life. And I want to make sure that as you guys kind of think through this that you're really keeping in mind that there are a couple of things that we want to promote. One is it's abundantly clear that this is a -- this is an awesome solution to a very large problem in Austin. But I think there are some things that need to be worked out. I think the last problem is a big one. But another one you can see in all of the other markets is oversaturation in the markets. It's not saturation, that's the problem. It's oversaturation that's the problem. That's a function of the companies that are detached from true market fundamentals that come in in the way of beating competition isn't being the most efficient or having the best technology, but it's oversaturating to a market to a point where people like me, which is this the co-founder of a dockless scooter company called Goat, will be unable to compete because we don't have VC-backed company. I operate on true market fundamentals.

Put out a pilot concept, work in the city. I'm in the bunch in reference saying we've been sitting on the sidelines waiting for the appropriate rules and regulations and guidelines and we wanted to do a small pilot launch to understand the market fundamentals in Austin to make sure the business model is sustainable. And the vc companies out of California, vc backed companies out of California, all three of which are here from similar backgrounds. I want to make sure as you're drafting this, you're not just thinking of the big companies out of California but thinking of guys like Michael shram, you know, who lived in district 7 and have been here his whole life. It's an amazing solution that has tremendous phone Shiley in this community. As a resident and other people who earn income from this

[5:27:25 PM]

business model as well, I'm a massive supportive of it. We want to look at oversaturation. Any financial requirement such as permitting or regulations that require a lot of legwork or individuals that are dedicated to oversee these things are in and of itself inhibitors to smaller new entrants to come into a market. And time and time again, you're going to hear technology is going to be the solution to a lot of your problems and consumer problems, but a function of good technology is a good -- is also a function of competition, really good competition. So I think this is not about selecting one or two vendors or moving to profit sharing for high fees for permits, this is a function of promoting competition and keeping the market open for all types of businesses and people from all areas of this country. Specifically here in the Austin area. [Buzzer] Cool. >> Kitchen: Thank you. >> Cool. Thank you, guys. >> Kitchen: Brian, you're next. After that, Elliott Mcfadden. >> I'm the head of public poll spio -- policy for spin. I'm happy to be here. We're thankful for the ordinance that you are embarking on. A quick update on what we've been doing on the ground here in Austin. For the last ten months, we've been working on a collaborative basis trying to communicate with as many stakeholders as possible. We met with capital metro, universities, Travis county, and obviously members of the city staff. Since then, we were able to work on a closed pilot with St. Edwards university right here in town and that was actually something that was suggested to us by capital metro because of the transit problems in that area. Now, closest is only the university can use it and bikes are supposed to stay on campus. We launched this in early February, and so far, even though it's a small campus, 160 acres, there's been very promising.

[5:29:28 PM]

Cumulatively, we've seen 155 miles ridden just within campus. There's a place for dockless mobility solutions here in Austin and we would urge the council and the staff to look at our operations and see what are the lessons learned? What are the pros and cons. We've been trying our best to do it responsibly with a modest fleet of 100, 125 bikes. At the same time, we're eager to bring our scooters to Austin as well. And as we've done for the past 10 months, we had the city's wishes after the city made it clear to us that last month any operators that operated outside of the city's deliberate process would be ineligible to participate in the pilot program. My hope is that the city's words do matter even if it were to launch on may 1 if we were permitted with the scooter operations, we would start off from a severe

disadvantage from a pure competitive basis if the companies have been operating here for over a month. That's my hope that you guys can sort of take that into consideration. We don't think that following the rules should result in us being the -- having the disadvantage in the marketplace. Thank you very much. >> Kitchen: Thank you. After Elliott Mcfadden, we'll have Keith bird. Keith here? Okay? Keith is not here, then Troy folks? Okay? >> Madam chair, I think I had some time donated. >> Kitchen: Yes, you did. Elizabeth Webb. Is she here? Elliott has five minutes. >> Good afternoon chairwoman kitchen, councilwoman Garza, madam alter, and mayor pro tem. I'm Elliott fadden and addressing you not just as the executive director of bike share of Austin but also a nationally recognized leader of shared use

[5:31:28 PM]

transportation a and a 26-year Austin resident. I'm here to urge you not to rush through the process on dockless bikes and scooters and follow the timeline that the council adopted back in February which respects the process and public input and seeks to avoid the mistakes that other cities have been making with dockless bike share. Regardless of where you stand on dockless bikes or scooters, the staff's proposal subverts the public voice in this discussion. If the council adopts this new accelerated pilot, you will do so before the end of the initial public comment on the pilot. In fact, as a south austinite, I would miss out on any comment because the last public forum is April 28, a couple of days after you would be adopting this. In addition in our concern with stakeholders, we heard from the daa, the park foundation, the Austin neighborhood's council. So as something as potentially controversial and impactful as dockless bike sharing scooters, I asked, why would you adopt a new policy before we heard from the public. Our priority-first is to the residents of this city, not to west coast and Chinese venture capitalist companies. The problems the other cities are experiencing with dockless vehicles are great, from piles of cheap up safe bikes blocking sidewalks and negatively impacting those in the disabled community and Ada access, to bikes that end up in city dumps and in creeks and rivers. This brings up specifically escooters and ebikes. We think about those ending up in our creeks and rivers, what does it mean to have lithium batteries ending up in our waterways? And what does it mean to our zero waste goal if we have piles of bikes in our city dump? These are questions that deserve

[5:33:28 PM]

a thoughtful response. And rushing a pilot means that we will not be addressing them. The smart path is to realize that these companies' only objective is to produce a return on investment, not general public good. We hear much about the foreign and domestic venture capital being docked on the model, if the model is so great, why can they not wait a couple of months for us to do the process that we set out. Are we placating bullies that don't want to wait for the result of a community process. Since meeting public policy objectives and respecting our community values are not part of the deliverables to investors, we need to admit this and tailor our policies to reflect profitability and impact on their profitability to reach our desired goals. This means a pilot needs to take into account time sensitive

performance measures and performance bonds, fines that have real financial impact on bad behavior, whether someone who is acting poorly should be allowed to participate in the pilot. And a fee structure to ensure we have the city staff to enforce. The city of Seattle is recently mentioned their fee structure is not prosing enough revenue for staff to do any of the enforcement that is needed so these operators are operating essentially with little repercussion for abuse. So the question is, with \$15,000 per vendor compensate the public for the costs to deal with all of these problems and pay for enforcement? These vendors stand to make hundreds of millions of dollars if their model works. Why can't -- why are Austin residents being asked to bear the cost of their private ventures. Charging so little represents a subsidy from our taxpayers to this private venture. These are just a few of the issues that we need to wrangle as we look to adapt to the new technology while respecting our residents and our community values. It's not something to be rushed.

[5:35:30 PM]

And I ask that the mobility committee and the council stick to the process and timeline that you have established that will produce the best results and be smart. And ask that city staff effectively enforce current law until we have a smart way forward. Thank you. >> Kitchen: Okay. See Troy, you're our last speaker. >> Okay. I'll make it short. I know it's been a long day. My notes are kind of smeared too. Anyways, 14-years I've been living here. And I pay a lot in property taxes here. I believe in electric transportation 100%. But the problem I have is with the use of public right of way. That is crazy. Because if -- if you're going to open up that and let people utilize the right of way, then maybe we're going to do wagons. I'm going to have dockless wagons. Maybe I'm going to have clothes that are lifted up by drones. You know? There's unlimited things that can be used on the right of way. So I think we really need to address this thing about the right of way. And it's not that I don't believe in dockless, but I believe that they need to pay their share of something because like I said, I pay a lot in property taxes. And they're coming here paying zero in property taxes. And I don't know if they're even paying anything for the local sales tax. How that's collected. And what type of licenses are they getting? And who monitors that? So there's a number of things. And I'm sure you understand. But in China, where there's wastelands of all of those

[5:37:31 PM]

bikes. Mo bike was sold for \$3 million. A lot of money being thrown from line bike to bird -- bird got \$115 million in funding. So, we need to see where these are coming from. And I hope that you guys stand up to some of these large companies out there. And support the local companies that are out there. There's plenty of bicycle rental people out here that have been doing it for days -- for years. And now they're going to have these birds dropped right in front of them? That's not right. So just take that into consideration. San Francisco just put a cease and desist for bird, line bike, and one of the other companies. Show, there's a lot going on out there. But I just wanted to give my perspective a little bit. >> Kitchen: Thank you. >> Thank you. >> Kitchen: Do we have questions from coup sill. If staff wants to can

come. >> We have one Mr. Speaker set up. >> Kitchen: We're tight on time, you know? So are you -- if you can just take one minute. Because I know you came in late and we'll go ahead and hear you. But just one minute because we need -- we're already over and we need our staff to come back up because we have questions. So, mm-hmm. >> Okay. I apologize for -- I apologize for taking all of the -- >> Kitchen: That's okay. >> I'm Dan, I live in district 9, I live half a mile from here, three quarters of a mile. Perfect distance for a scooter ride. I have been taking scooters back and forth to work, commuting. I usually walk. But sometimes I'm late to work. In the past, I was just late. Now I find a scooter and speed up my walk from 25 minutes to 10 minutes. I know that you have regulations in front of you. I'm not here to speak for or against the particular regulations, but just to say that for people like me who do

[5:39:31 PM]

not drive, who cannot drive, this is -- this is just a fantastic, a fantastic thing. And I also, for my wife, she's been using them. She works on campus at UT. She takes -- she takes the bus there. And sometimes she has to walk about half an hour within campus from part of campus to del med. It's the kind of trip that she absolutely -- no bus can take her there. If she took a bike in the middle of the day, she'd be sweating all over. So oi just hope that we can find a framework that works. Thanks. >> Kitchen: Okay. Thank you. Colleagues, does anyone have any questions that they'd like to ask? Yes, go right ahead. >> Can you explain what it is that's on the council agenda for next week? When I read the direct ordinance, it looks like it's a little clarifying language, it doesn't look like it's setting up the whole system of regulations. >> Kitchen: When you do that, can you explain the relationship between that and the pilot program? >> Yes, councilmember. I'll try to. What the fix is is in terms of vending in the right of way, a clarification that legalsing or renting a vehicle is, in fact, the same as purchasing merchandise. And so that would give us the ability to enforce that piece of the ordinance or what I believe the intent of the ordinance was. But we want to have the authority to do what we intend to do. As you know, councilmember, we will be finishing our public listening sessions on the 28th, the last items are on the 28th. So we actually feel like we've had good input thus far and we believe that the process that we're pursuing is a permit system similar to Seattle that

[5:41:32 PM]

would permit users on to the right of way on a six-month rotating basis. So every year, obviously, we come back to council to reup that authority. With regards to fees, you know, council has already weighed in on what the cost of the fees were. The \$30, that's why the cost is what it is, as you know, in the state of Texas, we have to base our fees on what it costs us to operate the system. So we obviously would be updating that on an annual basis as we get a better understanding of what the fees might be. >> Kitchen: With regard to the pilot, I'm trying to remember, I know that we -- we passed a resolution relating to the pilot, but I'm not remembering the scope of that. So are we talking about this ordinance next week to clarify the existing law, like you said? And then continue with the timeline of the pilot? Or I'm not understanding how they -- and I'm not remembering exactly what when he said the scope of the

pilot was. >> So I believe the scope or the -- the item passed by council that we brought to you gave us the authority to run a pilot up to 12 months. Essentially what we're saying is we are into a launch process and that the permits being a six-month basis, every six-month the companies that are participating would have to renew it. Of course, council always has the authority to -- to on an annual basis say we don't want to do those permits anymore and cancel the program. So we struggled with calling it an ongoing pilot. In fact, I think what we're talking about is moving into a six-month rotation cycle of permitting and moving into this sort of boldly and realizing that this mobility is going to be popular up and on the streets. >> Kitchen: Okay. Other questions. Did you -- you have one -- >> Yeah, I had more. >> -- [Indiscernible]. >> In the presentation, you had a map? >> Yes.

[5:43:32 PM]

>> Can you -- I don't understand what the point of that border is? >> One of the things we know from our interactions from the companies and already studying the market is that our dense downtown core or central core will be a focus of interest by many of the companies. That's how it's played out in other cities. And so, you know, we want to make sure that we don't oversaturate or attempt not to oversaturate that area and that would be the limit on the initial number of permits within that inner core area. That area covers not just downtown but large section of south and east Austin. Then we would give additional permits as companies came in with plans to distribute beyond that core. So, for instance, if -- if it goes up to mlk, if the company came in with a plan to distribute and focus a number of devices north of mlk, say from the university up to the medical corridor and state complex, they would be able to get additional permits. And so, it's an incentive-based program that in the core we limit the total number of devices depending on how many players are in the market and how many permits are available. But also encourage them to acquire more permits by going and serving other areas. >> Okay. >> And we chose that geographic area because it was predefined by other ordinances. >> Kitchen: Mayor pro tem, if you will ask your questions. >> I'm sorry, did I interrupt you? >> Thank you very much. And so I listened to the first part of the presentation before I got here. So I don't think I missed this point. But I need to ask for clarification. On slide three, what's happening in Austin, the taxpayers paying to impound the devices. Later you explained -- could you just help me understand that? That's because the costs are being borne at this point by the taxpayers and those are the costs of responding to the companies that have launched outside of our regulations?

[5:45:36 PM]

>> Yes, ma'am. >> Tovo: You're tracking those so they can be accounted for. >> Individualized by company. Yes, ma'am. The authority gives us a fee for impoundment as well as recouped costs. Our intent is to recoup actual costs. >> Tovo: And I hope you didn't cover this case before I got here, but as I understand, the company that launched on fingerprinted was given its equipment back and if you've already explained why you made that decision, I'll catch up with one of my colleagues. But otherwise, I would ask you to explain why that -- why that company received its -- its bikes back. Because I

understand, that's then caused a chain reaction where another company jumped into the fray and, you know, that's certainly not the situation. And I appreciate that, I want to echo your comments, staff's comments that, you know, we really appreciate those companies that are participating and collaborating with the city and waiting for the process pilot to start and they're doing so in coordination with our -- with our process, with our defined process. That's the kind of business we want here in Austin. And I appreciate the work of those companies who are playing the -- playing the -- participating in this in the way that we would expect in businesses that want to do -- that want to be successful here in our city. >> Yes, councilmember. Quite frankly, we were caught a little surprised by the initial launch. So we were not prepared to charge a fee for the impoundment piece of it. We are quickly getting those capabilities up to speed. We are prepared to seek repayment of the actual costs that it costs us. We know that it -- you know, we released those devices during our business period, so we had collected those on Friday, Saturday, and Sunday. And it was Monday, midday, before we were able to actually get those back to them. With the -- showing the photo evidence, what the issues were. We were enforcing for safety and

[5:47:36 PM]

blocking of the right of way as our understanding of what our capabilities were in terms of enforcement. So, that's what this ordinance hopefully will resolve. >> Tovo: I have other questions. Probably my colleagues do as well. One follow-up. One of the speakers talked about the fact that companies -- the city of Austin told everyone who was interested that companies who launched before, we had a pilot program in place would be ineligible to participate. Is that accurate, I guess, and if so, do you intend to exclude companies that launched before the pilot started from participation? >> Councilmember, that's a discussion that we'll need to have with you. But we're essentially suggesting that the pilot would essentially conclude at the end of the listening sessions and that we would move directly to a permit session. Any company that wanted to participate in terms of acquiring permits would need to pay any costs that need to be incurred by the city prior to this. >> Currently it requires that the company be in good standing with the city. >> Tovo: It sounds like I may need to follow up with you outside. >> Yes, ma'am. >> Kitchen: I appreciate my colleagues for bearing with us. We went quite a bit over. I'm prepared to say as long as anyone has questions. Anyone else have questions? >> Madam chair, I believe there might be a meeting at 6:00. >> Okay, well -- I'm just saying I think you might be -- >> I do share the concern that -- I think it's important for those businesses that have been participating that there be a recognition that they not be penalized by in effect allowing the businesses to participate that have not

[5:49:37 PM]

participated in the process. I have serious concerns about that. Question that I have is what is the start date that we had anticipated for the pilot? >> Originally? Originally? >> Kitchen: Originally. >> July, August. >> Kitchen: July, August, okay. Any other questions? >> Has our transportation department spoke with Edwards, so we can figure out lessons learned from their pilot or do you plan to. >> We have



been in communication with them to better understand what that program was as indicated by one of the speakers. It was a closed system, so only St. Ed's members were -- or St. Edwards related faculty and students were able to use the system. We did have some of those bikes show up on our right of way. However, all of the transactions was not occurring on the right of way. It was occurring at part of the St. Edward's community. So we determined that was in the realm of our current ordinances. I think they've had a positive outcome. So that's all I can tell you. >> I just mean like things like where they were -- to be placed. We talked about the boxes, maybe they've learned -- >> We will talk to them about that, yes. >> Tovo: I can talk about -- I can ask questions about this after the meeting or outside of the session. I'm interested in some of the comments that were raised about making sure our fees for this cover the actual staff costs. I know that's a requirement, but I want to make sure that we're really fully accounting for all of the costs of managing it. I got an opportunity to -- had an opportunity to ride one of the electric scooters when they were demonstrating here. I thought they were great fun. I'm happy about this option. I'm distressed with the way some of the companies have rolled out their product in advance of the ordinance. Again, I don't think that -- I don't think that we want to be a welcoming environment here in the city of Austin and that

[5:51:37 PM]

really requires cooperation on both sides. I've gotten a handful of constituent e-mails today, calls, because I represent a lot of downtown. And that's where a lot of the activity is taking place. I heard concerns that range from what they're experiencing on the sidewalks to scooters on trails. So those are some of the -- some of the questions that I had for you. Are scooters or electric scooters going to be allowed on the trails. Have we -- do we have a sense of the environmental impact on that. Then I mentioned the fees. >> If I can just mention the trails, motorized vehicles fall into this, even though they're electrical are not allowed in the parks is my understanding. This would only be for the public right of way for the streets and sidewalks. Of course, state law allows low speed electric assist scooters and bikes on sidewalks. They don't discriminate that on bike lanes. We want to make sure they're consistent with that. My understanding is they're not allowed in the parks. That, again, we have to make sure that the park trails and regulations are clearly -- >> Tovo: One of the constituent e-mails I got today talked about having seen scooters out on the trail. >> Sure. I hope council understands, even with a permit system, there will be a period of learning for our community. And so, you know, we're wise to that as well. That there will be a learning curve for everybody. >> Kitchen: I have a quick question relating to -- there were a number of suggestions that you went over that would be part of a permit requirement or process. I don't see those in the ordinance. Insurance, performance bonds, the numbered permits, any of those kinds of things. You had a slide that listed a number of things. But I don't see them in the ordinance. So was there a reason for that?

[5:53:38 PM]

Were you thinking that the parameters would be set up in some other way? Or maybe I read the ordinance too fast? Is it all in the -- is it all in the ordinance. >> Let's answer that off line to bring the process instead of us looking through it and -- >> Kitchen: We can answer that offline. I thought they were -- I thought the items you mentioned were useful items and I just wanted to see that level of detail in the ordinance. >> There may be a specific legal question that you'll want to ask. >> Kitchen: Okay. Other questions? Okay. Thank you all very much. And thank you to my colleagues for their patience. All right, that's it. We're up going to adjourn the meeting.